

**Draft Summary of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting  
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)  
March 22, 2001**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting on March 22, 2001 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary of the discussion for information purposes for interested parties who could not attend the meeting.

### **Introduction**

Attendees were welcomed to the Work Group meeting. The meeting objectives were discussed. The Work Group Meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Flip chart notes taken during the meeting are included as Attachment 3.

### **Action Items – February 22, 2000 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting**

The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from the previous Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting.

**Action Item #R13:** Pete Dangermond will provide the Work Group an overview of the Recreation Master Plan Framework developed by the JPA.

Status: Mr. Dangermond presentation is a part of tonight's agenda.

**Action Item #R14:** Develop White Paper regarding Endangered Species Act and the relicensing process.

Status: There are currently two ESA consultations underway regarding Lake Oroville Facilities operations, one for ongoing operations and the other for the relicensing process. The Facilitator updated the group on discussions occurring at the Environmental Work Group and reported that after a discussion with NMFS, DWR, and DFG regarding ESA, USFWS intended to develop a presentation that explains the approach to be taken on ESA issues during relicensing. DWR will continue to update that Work Group on progress with the ongoing ESA consultation.

**Action Item #R15:** Provide Work Group with Interim Projects Task Force project screening Criteria.

Status: The screening criteria have been posted to the project website, and were distributed to the Work Group.

**Action Item #R16:** Develop draft issue statements for Work Group review and comment.

Status: Development of draft issue statements is on the agenda for tonight's meeting.

### **Interim Projects Task Force Report**

Steve Nachtman of the consulting team updated the Work Group on Interim Projects Task Force activities. Steve reported that the Task Force had met twice since their formation. In the first meeting, the Task Force reviewed a straw-person proposal regarding process and criteria for reviewing and determining whether a project should be considered for interim implementation.

In the second meeting the Task Force looked at all the issues brought up during Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group and other public meetings, and identified those that could potentially qualify as interim projects. After applying the criteria agreed to in the first meeting, about 20 projects had been identified that required more elaborate environmental analysis. Steve mentioned that approximately 70 potential interim projects remained for further evaluation. The Task Force intends to prepare a list of recommended interim projects for Work Group consideration by May 24, 2001. The Task Force will meet again on April 20, 2001.

- The Work Group discussed the Task Force's progress as it relates to the Riverbend Project (AKA Feather River Enhancement Project), and its status as an interim project. Dale Hoffman-Floerke of DWR said that the Task Force had discussed removing the project from the interim list because of the magnitude of the project and its failure to pass the established criteria. Ultimately, the Task Force felt it was significant enough to both discuss with the full Work Group and continue to carry parts of the larger project as potential candidate interim projects. She added that DWR requested Bob Sharkey of the Feather River Recreation and Parks District to identify smaller projects that are part of the Riverbend Project that might qualify for interim consideration. He provided that list with preliminary cost estimates to DWR. She mentioned that these projects would be added to the list of projects currently under consideration by the Task Force but there is some concern regarding the applicability of the environmental document originally prepared for the full project over twenty years ago. The Work Group agreed to see a presentation regarding the Riverbend Project at their next meeting.
- One participant mentioned that failure to act on the Riverbend Project soon might jeopardize redevelopment funds that the City of Oroville set aside to provide infrastructure to the park site (as part of the project).
- The Task Force has also established a sub Task Force to deal exclusively with trail issues.

### **JPA Presentation of Recreation Framework**

Peter Dangermond of the Dangermond Group provided the Work Group with a possible framework for the Oroville Facilities recreation plan that his firm developed in response to requests from the JPA. He identified the major recreation resources in the Oroville Complex, potential recreation opportunities, issues and constraints, and recommended studies needed for a complete recreation analysis. The presentation and talking points are appended to this summary as Attachment 4.

### **Development of Scoping Statements**

At the last Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting the consulting team was tasked with developing issue statements based on the recreation issues and interests identified by all sources to date. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group received a copy of the draft issue statements, including examples of the issues and interests used to develop the statement. The Work Group was cautioned that the example issues and interests provided did not reflect all the issues used to develop a particular statement. The Work Group was also provided with a copy of the master list of Recreation Issues and Interests. The draft issue statements with issues and interest examples and the master list of Recreation Issues and Interests are appended to this summary as Attachments 5 and 6, respectively.

Steve Nachtman described the Issue Statements as an integral part of the Scoping Document (required by NEPA) that drive the process from the Work Groups issues and interests to study plans, to a recreation plan, and ultimately to the settlement agreements that the license is based on. Issue statements begin the process of finding out what information is needed during the study phase of the relicensing effort. He added that the FERC will look at this information to see if the elements of the proposed recreation plan are supported.

The Work Group discussed each issue statement and agreed to the following drafts.

#### ***Recreation 1***

Adequacy of existing project recreation facilities, opportunities, and access to accommodate current seasonal use and future demand.

#### ***Recreation 1A***

Assess FERC compliance (record of compliance, status, and assurance for future compliance) at Oroville Project facilities and determine appropriate non-compliance actions.

### ***Recreation 2***

Adequacy of public safety at Oroville Project recreation facilities.

### ***Recreation 3***

Effects of facilities operations on recreation and socioeconomic opportunities.

### ***Recreation 4***

Adequacy of maintenance and clean-up activities associated with recreation areas.

### ***Recreation 5***

Appropriate recreation management structure, approach and funding.

### ***Socioeconomics 1***

Potential for economic development through recreation opportunities at the Oroville Facilities.

### ***Socioeconomics 2***

Feasibility of utilizing project water and power for local economic development.

- After some discussion, the Work Group agreed to have the consulting team continue with further revisions to the issue statements to capture the groups' thoughts (particularly Issue Statement #1 and assurances concerns) for review and begin developing goal statements for consideration at the next Work Group meeting.
- Rafting interests agreed to submit their issues to the Facilitator for inclusion into the master issue list.

### **Next Meeting**

The Work Group agreed to meet on Thursday, April 19, 2001 from 6:00 PM to 10:00 PM (location to be announced).

The Work Group was reminded of the following meetings:

Cultural Resources Work Group – March 27, 2001

Plenary Group – March 28, 2001

Engineering and Operations Work Group – April 5, 2001

Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group – April 10, 2001

Environmental Work Group – April 18, 2001

Detailed information regarding these meetings is available on the project web site.

### **Agreements Made**

1. The Work Group agreed to review draft issues statements developed by the consulting team at their next meeting.
2. The Work Group agreed to see a presentation regarding the Riverbend Project.
3. The Work Group agreed to meet again on April 19, 2001 from 6:00 PM to 10:00 PM (location to be announced).

### **Action Items**

The following list of action items identified by the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

**Action Item #R17:** Presentation to the Work Group on Riverbend Park  
**Responsible:** Feather River Recreation and Parks Department  
**Due Date:** April 19, 2001

**Action Item #R18:** Consulting Team will revise issue statements and distribute them to the Work Group prior to their next meeting.

**Responsible:** Consulting Team

**Due Date:** April 10, 2001

**Action Item #R19:** State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) to be deposited in document repository

**Responsible:** DWR staff

**Due Date:** April 19, 2001